PATENT

C. REMARKS

Status of the Claims.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, and 14 are currently present in the Application, and claims 1, 6, and 11 are independent claims. Claims 1, 6, and 11 have been amended, claims 5, 10, 13, 15, and 16 have been cancelled, and no claims have been added.

Examiner Interview

Applicants note with appreciation the telephonic interview conducted between Applicants' representative and the Examiner on January 31, 2006. During the telephonic interview, the Examiner and Applicants' representative discussed amending independent claims to incorporate limitations included in their respective allowable dependent claims. In addition, the Examiner and Applicants' representative discussed amending the independent claims in order to overcome the 112 rejections. After the interview, Applicants' representative provided the Examiner with a proposed claim amendment to overcome the 112 rejections, which was later agreed upon by the Examiner and the Primary Examiner. Applicants' have included such amendment in this response.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants note with appreciation the allowance of claims 5, 10, 13, 15, and 16 if rewritten in independent form. Applicants have incorporated the limitations of these claims into their respective independent claims in this response in order to place their respective independent claims in condition for allowance. As a result, Applicants' have also canceled claims 5, 10, 13, 15, and 16 in this response.

Docket No. SZ9-97-009N

Page 7 of 9 Droz, et. al. - 09/463,002 Atty Ref. No. R326

Drawings

Applicants note that the Examiner did not indicate whether the formal drawings, filed with Applicants' application, are accepted by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner indicate whether the formal drawings are accepted in the next office communication.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1, 6, and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims were previously amended to include the word "concurrently," which was not found in the original specification. Applicants have removed the word "concurrently" from claims 1, 6, and 11 in this response, and request removal of the 112 first paragraph rejection to these claims.

Claims 1, 6, and 11 stand rejected under U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, because particular claim limitations lack sufficient antecedent basis. The Office Action contents that the term "the sending nodes" lacks sufficient antecedent basis included in claims 1, 6, and 10. As agreed upon by the Examiner and the Primary Examiner, Applicants' have combined the first and second elements of the independent claims into a single element to claim that the same sending node includes both a first label and a second label into a cell. Therefore, Applicants request removal of the 112 second paragraph rejection to these claims.

Claim Rejections - Alleged Obviousness Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cidon, et al.

Docket No. SZ9-97-009N

Page 8 of 9 Droz, et. al. - 09/463,002 Atty Ref. No. R326

PATENT

(U.S. Patent No. 5,579,480, herein after "Cidon") in view of Kobyasi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,333,932, hereinafter "Kobyasi"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Applicants have incorporated the limitations of allowable dependent claims 5, 10, and 16 into their respective independent claims 1, 6, and 11. Therefore, independent claims 1, 6, and 11 are allowable. Each of the remaining claims 2, 4, 7, 9, 12, and 14 each depend upon one of the allowable independent claims 1, 6, and 11. Therefore, claims 2, 4, 7, 9, 12, and 14 are each allowable for the same reasons as their respective independent claims.

Conclusion

As a result of the foregoing, it is asserted by Applicants that the remaining claims in the Application are in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request an early allowance of such claims.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the Applicants' attorney listed below if the Examiner believes that such a discussion would be helpful in resolving any remaining questions or issues related to this Application.

Respectfully submitted,

Leslie A. Van Leeuwen, Reg. No. 42,196

Van Leeuwen & Van Leeuwen

Attorney for Applicant

Telephone: (512) 301-6738 Facsimile: (512) 301-6742

Docket No. SZ9-97-009N

Page 9 of 9 Droz, et. al. - 09/463,002 Atty Ref. No. R326